

RC 131
.04 L3
Copy 1


RC
131
.04L3


LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. RC 131

Shelf OAL3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.





THE
CHOLERA IN CINCINNATI:

OR A
CONNECTED VIEW

OF THE
CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE
HOMEOPATHISTS AND THE METHODIST EXPOSITOR.

ALSO,

10
4234
A REVIEW


OF THE REPORT READ BEFORE THE HOMEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION.

BY S. A. LATTA, M. D.

3 CINCINNATI:

MORGAN & OVEREND, PRINTERS.

1850.



~~Box 25~~

RC 131
Oct 3

HOMEOPATHIC THEORY.

"Similia similibus curantur,"—LIKE CURES LIKE.

HAHNEMANN.

HOMEOPATHY VS. THE EXPOSITOR.

INTRODUCTION.

It is proper that the reader should be informed, in advance, of the causes which led to the controversy hereafter given in detail, and of the motives which prompted the editor of the *Expositor* to enter the arena of controversy with the Homeopaths. In May, 1849, soon after the appearance of the Epidemic Cholera, in this city, the Homeopathic, Eclectic, Indian, and Negro Doctors, with other irregular practitioners, put forth, through the secular press, reports so extravagant, of success in the cure of cholera, that the regular profession were completely disgusted, and as a consequence, few, if any, could be found willing to report as desired by the board of health. They readily perceived that it would be impossible to retain a reputation for truthfulness, whatever might be their success in practice, and keep pace with the mongrel tribes of irregulars, who, indeed, were then already too far in advance to be overtaken, even though the dictates of conscience had been disregarded. The strictly scrupulous in the regular profession were deterred by the first consideration; while others, if any there were, whose conscience did not interpose a bar, were, doubtless, deterred by the second, that of utter despair of ever overtaking the gentlemen above alluded to, who had already astonished the world with their reported success. In unobtrusive silence, the members of the regular profession pursued the even tenor of their way, contending by day and night with the angel of death, as he silently struck among the masses in the street, or in the family circle of the mansion, the cottage, the garret, or the cellar. Two months of alarm and terror the most appalling had come and gone, and still no voice was heard through the public journals, from all the ranks of the regulars. Meanwhile the irregulars of every grade and complexion were astonishing the community with new and startling reports of success.

The editor of the *Expositor* had seen, with disgust, the movements of these brave knights, and heard the successive blasts of

their trumpets which appeared to wax louder and louder as the invading pestilence retired. Forbearance was thought to have ceased to be a virtue, and truth seemed to demand a response which should at least fix the attention of community upon the alledged facts in their report.

In doing this, he was aware that many would be offended, and that combinations would probably be formed for defense, if not for defamation and slander; but duty called, and he was disposed to risk the consequences, rather than forfeit the answer of a good conscience and the claims of manly independence, which should ever characterize those having the editorial control of the press.

The duty he had to perform was one of a delicate character. The people were being misled with respect to matters of vital importance to themselves, by reports the most extravagant in their details. The issues involved were more than the loss of fortune; they were the issues of life and death. Many were being induced, by these exaggerated reports, to rely upon remedies for the cure of cholera, which were, in his judgment, wholly impotent, and as a consequence, many valuable lives would be lost. What could he do better than question the truth of their reports, for, obviously, they were untrue. And how could he keep silent, with facts like these before his eyes? He resolved he would not, and hence he ventured to the rescue of truth, irrespective of consequences.

The first bulletin to which he invited the attention of the public, was that of Drs. Pulte & Ehrmann, issued August 11th, 1849. The privilege having been granted, these gentlemen replied in self-defense through the medium of the paper of which he was editor, and were answered, and there it was thought the matter would end. But soon the friends of Homeopathy, assembled in obedience to public call, formed an association for defense, and appointed Messrs. Taft, Barrett, Sawyer, Carlisle, and Crawford, a committee to reply to the Expositor; who put forth their views in the form of an octavo pamphlet of forty-eight pages, attacking alike fiercely the facts and reasoning of the Expositor. The talents, learning, and gentlemanly bearing of the committee, entitle their report to a candid and careful review, especially with respect to the facts involving the veracity of the parties between whom they essay to decide. No member of the committee, it is believed, makes any pretensions to a knowledge of medical science, nor yet to a critical knowledge of the system of Homeopathy itself,—but still that Mr. Taft is learned in the legal profes-

sion, that Mr. Barrett is distinguished as a Swedenborgian divine, and that the other gentlemen of the committee are entitled, as citizens, to high consideration, no one will doubt. And although he is compelled to question their ability to decide the medical questions at issue, or even to discuss them understandingly, he wishes it distinctly understood, in advance, that he has no desire to detract from their claims to confidence in any other respect. He will not question their veracity, although they are obviously at fault in the statement of facts, resulting from an *ex parte* hearing of the case. And now that it is deemed inexpedient to refer to the subject again in the paper of which he has charge, he has resolved upon the issue of a pamphlet, which will contain a connected view of the controversy, as conducted in the Expositor, and a review of the Homeopathic report, to which allusion has just been made; and with what success he has met the issue, the reader must judge after perusing the following pages.

CONNECTED VIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY.

BULLETIN OF DRS. PULTE AND EHRMANN.

The above named gentlemen, Homeopathic physicians of this city, issued in the Gazette and other political journals, August 11, 1849, the following as the result of their practice for the cure of Cholera :

"We have treated," say Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, "from the 1st May to the 1st August, instant, eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients, of which five hundred and thirty-eight exhibited the symptoms of vomiting, diarrhea, and cramps, including a great many, from sixty to seventy, in deep state of collapse—the balance, five hundred and seventy-eight, had the symptoms of vomiting and rice-water discharges, and were prevented from running into a higher stage of the disease by early applications of the proper medicines.

"Of the collapsed cases, a great many were cured, the success depending upon the medicines given in the early stages. In those improperly treated, by opiates particularly, our success was difficult; but in cases where the patient was treated, at first, by camphor alone, or where he went immediately into collapse, after being attacked, the result was very favorable.

"Of the eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients, four hundred and seventy-four were Americans, and six hundred and forty-two Germans, including a few Irish ;

the mortality of the whole number was thirty-five, of which two were Americans and thirty-three Germans. Of the latter not one half should have died, but from their carelessness of diet, and want of knowledge of the insidious character of this disease. We accounted among those who died, all which we had attended ourselves, even if we were called at too late a time to be of real use.

"Besides the above eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients, we treated during the same time, thirteen hundred and fifty cases of a mixed character, mostly diarrheas with rumbling in the bowels (cholerina), and toward the close of the epidemic, a great number of dysenteries, some of which were of a very malignant character (we lost none of them however), also a good many nervous fever with typhoid tendency.

"To verify the above statement, we have made out a complete list of all the cholera cases, with names and dates, for reference at any time when required.

"The principal remedy used in the beginning of cholera, was camphora, the tincture of which was prepared in the proportion of one part of the gum to six parts of alcohol, as advised by Hahnemann himself, who first recommended this remedy in 1829. The dose in which it was applied was equal to one or two drops every five minutes, for one or one and a half hour, until profuse perspiration ensued. During this time, the patient had to be well covered, and in most cases the camphor alone produced a complete cure without the help of any other remedies."

EXPOSITOR'S NOTICE OF PULTE AND EHLMANN'S REPORT.

In noticing the preceding bulletin of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, the editor of the Expositor urged,

1. That it was undignified and unprofessional to appear in the public prints in praise of themselves, as in the report then under consideration. He alledged that it was a method adopted by nostrum sellers and quacks, and that it had always been looked upon with contempt by the regular profession.

2. He maintained that, according to their own showing, they had adopted Allopathic rather than Homeopathic treatment, administering the strongest tincture of camphor, in doses of one or two drops every five minutes. And in many instances he affirmed that from three to five drops were administered every three minutes, which was equal to fifteen or twenty grains of camphor every hour. This, he contended, was an abandonment of every principle of Homeopathy. The following are his remarks in *extenso* :

"*'Similia, similibus, curantur ;'* that which will produce symptoms analogous to the disease, will cure it, is the great fundamental principle upon which the system is founded. Had they acted in harmony with this, they would have given to their cholera patients something which would have produced purging and vomiting, such as ipecac, tartar emetic, etc. But instead of this, we find them employing camphor, and that, too, in larger doses than it is administered by most of their allopathic neighbors ; and who ever heard that camphor was emetic and cathartic.

"The infinitesimal doses, as well as the fundamental principle, according to the showing of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, have been abandoned, and yet they ascribe their cures,

to Homeopathy; but we doubt if they succeed in gulling the intelligent in community much longer by a system of quackery so palpably absurd—so grossly immoral. We have no doubt that camphor, administered in ten or twenty grain doses, would secure a reasonable share of success, whether employed by homeopathic or allopathic practitioners. It is known to community, that regular physicians have always relied upon the use of camphor in this disease to a great extent, in much smaller doses than those prescribed by the Homeopaths; and hence, if the latter have been successful, it is obviously (if their own statements can be relied upon) by the use of allopathic remedies, and not by infinitesimal doses of medicines, as they would have it understood. These gentlemen seem to have abandoned Hahnemann's theory, that "the hair of the dog would cure the bite." But is it not grossly immoral to practice such a deception upon community? We have long believed that homeopathic doctors were practicing Allopathy in disguise—employing the "samsons" of the system, such as calomel, corrosive sublimate, arsenic, camphor, belladonna, pulsatilla, and many other powerful articles, in full doses—but now we have proof which sets the question forever at rest.

"It is also notorious, that during the progress of the cholera, the Homeopaths have been equally unfortunate with the regulars, in producing salivation, and of this we shall furnish proof whenever demanded. Calomel, it may be, was not the general agent employed: corrosive sublimate being a more powerful article, and capable of solution, was preferred; and this we have found at the bedside of the sick more than once during the prevalence of the epidemic in this city.

"Heretofore we have been disposed to pity rather than censure some of those engaged in the practice of Homeopathy, believing them the dupes of a theory the most ridiculously absurd; but to our surprise and mortification, we find that we, rather than they, were duped by false pretensions. For instead of giving infinitesimal doses of medicine, as we supposed, which would produce the disease for which they were prescribed, we find them adopting the very same treatment employed by the regular profession. In this, we confess, we have been prodigiously gulled by these pretenders, and most cheerfully award to them a degree of cunning more than equal to the moral of the transaction.

"*Second.* We object to the report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, because it is immoral in its statement of facts. It is affirmed that they have treated four hundred and seventy-four cases of cholera among Americans since the first of May, and that but two out of the whole number have died. If this were true, as above remarked, the glory would not redound to Homeopathy, as these gentlemen would have it, but to Allopathy—to regular remedies, in full doses, as they themselves have made manifest in the report now under consideration. But alas for both, the report is not true.

"We know not what number of cases they had; but that more have died than they have reported, is absolutely certain. In the range of our own observation and acquaintance, not less than nine, instead of two, Americans are said to have died in their hands, which is probably not the one tenth of the whole number they have lost. In making this statement, we speak advisedly, in that these cases have been reported to us by responsible individuals, giving the names and residences of the Americans who were lost in their hands, whose names and residences will be given, if this statement should be contradicted by the parties concerned.

"Now, if these homeopathic doctors are so inaccurate in their reports of cures, what reliance can be placed upon their statements in any given case in which their interests are involved? Who can believe their representations either with respect to their mode of treatment or their success?

"We can scarcely conceive of a higher degree of immorality than that of deceiving community, with respect to the best means of preserving health and life, and yet this seems to have been the part acted by these homeopathic doctors.

"We regret exceedingly that we are called upon to make an *expose* like this, but, as a

public journalist, we feel that we could not do otherwise, without a criminal neglect of duty. For if nine cases have come within the range of our own observation, and those with whom we are associated, it is fair to conclude that the mortality attending the practice of these gentlemen is ten if not twenty times as great as they have reported it. But as we are not personally cognizant of all the facts stated, and as it is possible that some mistakes may have been made by our reporters, we shall most cheerfully permit the said Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann to be heard in self-defense in our columns, with respect to any fact stated in this article.

“Meanwhile we shall expect to learn more as to the results of their practice, both as it regards Americans and Germans, which it may not be necessary to publish should our present statement not be contradicted. But in the event of contradiction, either directly or indirectly, we assure all concerned that the names and residences of those to whom we have alluded, as having died under their treatment, will be forthcoming, with the names and residences of all others who may be reported hereafter.

“Thus far the regular profession have kept silent; but really this last attempt of the Homeopaths and others, to make them responsible for the thousands who have died during the epidemic, is beyond endurance.

“We have reported above, nine American patients who have perished in their hands, on what we conceive to be reliable authority, while, in fact, we have no doubt ninety-nine Americans and more have fallen victims to the cupidity of these distinguished Homeopaths; while hundreds, if not thousands, of Germans, have perished, by relying upon two and a half, and five dollar boxes of cholera preventives, which these gentlemen induced them to believe would be all that was needed to save them from its ravages.”

DRS. PULTE AND EH RMANN'S REPLY TO THE EXPOSITOR.

The following reply of the gentlemen above named was published in the Expositor “*verbatim et literatim*”—and hence the reader must recollect that the orthography, etymology, syntax, and prosody, are their own. In view of some of their remarks and insinuations respecting the literary attainments of the editor, he did not feel at liberty to make any corrections.

Rev. S. A. Latta

Doctor of allopathic medicine and

Author of “the trumpets.” Sir,

Several times during the summer you have sent forth volleys of wordy musketry in your Expositor against Homoeopathia and its votaries & adherents, calling them ‘pell mell’ dupes and quaks. Although this gratuitous offering of your zeal and genius was of no use in the desperate cause of Allopathia, as the public seems not to have taken special notice of it, yet it must have drawn the attention of the leading spirits in Allopathia on you and your abilities, as it is evident from the tone of your latest production and the manner of its distribution (it was thrown into every house almost in form of extras), that you are the chosen champion of Allopathia in her fearful struggle against the right of the people, to chose their own physicians, even to chose you, if they please. It must have been one of your proudest days on which you was thus elevated to the rank of Captain in the army of the regulars, which you had joined as an humble volunteer after having fought for years on your medical career single handed with no associate but the own high reputation for yourself. Thus far you have attained one

object of your eventful life, that of not to be considered a quack in medicine by your allopathic brethren, but whether you have succeeded as well in reaching the two other points of your ambition, that of avoiding the odium of quackery in religion and literary attainments, awaits further solution, as the specimen in hand does not seem to prognosticate favorably for the attainment of both of your objects.

With the above remarks we wanted to indicate the state of our own feelings by reading your article and probably would have ceased to notice it any farther, if it had not been for it containing some specific charges against us personally which compelled us for the sake of the community at large and the friends of homoeopathy especially to answer and explain them.

In the confused manner in which you have thrown the different charges against us together, it is impossible to follow you—we prefer to first arrange logically (what you should have done yourself, if such a training of the mind, as logic gives, was known to you) and then answer them accordingly. First you complain of our acting *immorally* and not with the propriety of professional gentlemen, by publishing the result of our practice in the late Cholera Epidemic.

You yourself did not consider this to be a very serious charge against us, or else you would have furnished your readers a sufficient amount of conclusive evidence in its support.—for instance you should have shown that we *were* actually according to the idea of the Allopathic faculty *professional gentlemen*, by which fact you might have made the public believe, that we were guilty of a breach of propriety by publishing ourselves our reports after the Cholera had subsided, although one, say a professional gentleman, might safely allow himself to be published and puffed at a great rate by another person, for instance if he is the Editor of a paper, by his co editor and be even allowed without any *breach of propriety*, to keep such an uncalled for puff as a *standing* advertisement for several weeks, say in such paper as the Expositor is. You should have further shown to an evidence, that our reports were althgether volunteered and not called for (as they really were) at the urgent desire of some of the public, who seemed to feel an interest in knowing the results of the homoeopathic treatment of the cholera—in not bringing this important argument in your favor forward, you had the Charity of a Christian in yourself all for yourself. You thought the concealment of the fact that we, in giving our reports, only were responding to a public call made on us, would be sufficient, particularly in an article of yours, to make the public forget its existence. In this you will certainly find yourself mistaken.

Finally you should have given sufficient reasons for your attack on our reports, the refutation of which was not necessary according to *your* representation of their reception by the public, which as you say, discredited them almost althgether. Now there was no necessity for you to kill over again, what as you say was already killed. You will perceive at once the silliness of your attitude in this affair by your own expressions.

Secondly, you charge us with having cured our patients allopathically in disguise deceiving in this way the public, and what is of still more importance and mortification, deceiving you, Dr. Latta. Now this would be a severe charge against us, particularly the last part of it, where you are yourselves so delicately touched in it. To deceive the public is immoral enough, but to play a trick upon your Argus eyes, that is not merely immoral, but really *cunning*, and you never knew anything about it (of course, you had had previous suspicions!) until now, but now all the faculty knows it, and the matter is set forever at rest. Yes, now it is known to the faculty, that camphor is the real specific in cholera, which they never knew or dreamed of before—now they want to claim a remedy as their own, which Hahnemann had twenty years before made known to the world to be given in precise the dose in which we, and every Homoeopathist have given it in cholera. But you „are too late,” Dr. Latta. Nobody, who knows anything about the question before us, will believe you, particularly not upon your

own testimony. Don't deceive yourself as to the standard of your own knowledge. Of your allopathic attainments, we will and must not judge ; of Homoeopathia, however, we declare *unhesitatingly*, you do not understand the A. B. C. Our homoeopathic laymen eclipse you in this branch of knowledge most effectually, if we may judge from the display in your article of your gross ignorance of all what pertains to the homoeopathic system. Here we might have wished for you to have known that old proverb : Si tarnisses, philosophus mansisses, if you had been silent, you might have continued to make people believe you knew something about homoeopathy ; but now, what a pity !

As regards that grand discovery you made at the bedside, finding there corrosive sublimate which we had given in solution, we await in perfect silence, but with the firm expectation the full prove of such a fact as you have offered to do when called for and for every ones gratification the disclosure of your *modus operandi*, how you could find out the true nature of our corrosive sublimate. That will astonish the chemists ! Now the 3d charge, and as this is the severest of all, you will allow us to be brief in its reply. You state confidently that we have lost nine Americans, instead of two, reported by us, in the late epidemic. Now as we and others are curious, to know more about this affair, you will oblige yourself and us in giving us the names of these persons, in as much as we again repeat, *that we have only lost two Americans*, which can be fairly and justly charged to our account. In your further remarks upon this subject where you try to extend your charity in burdening us with the loss of Ten times nine Americans, you should have spared yourself the flight of imagination to such a height, which always incurs the danger of a fall—You had better prove first the nine, which you promised to do.

As regards the loss of the thousands among the Germans, We would charitably recommend you further information, particularly at the board of health, where the bills paid to the several doctors. will show you the amount of work which was done and by whom it was done ; you will find it 99-100 to be allopathic. In conclusion we would advise you and your allopathic brethren to give reports *in full* to the public of all cases treated, in order to escape the heavy charge of the 6 thousands of the victims of Cholera which up to this time must tarnish the heretofore so unblemished escutcheon of Allopathy. But be candid.

J. H. PULTE.
B. EHLMANN.

COMMENTS UPON PULTE AND EHLMANN'S REPLY.

The editor of the Expositor, in alluding to the reply of the gentlemen above named, says :

“ In noticing the above, we are somewhat at a loss to know where to begin. It is a confused tissue of insinuations, in very bad English, evincing alike great ignorance of letters, and of science. In our reply we shall be brief, not because it is the “ most important, or hardest of all,” as Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann have said, toward the close of their article, but, because it is of but little importance. A few facts only will be noticed.

“ *First.* We have never intimated that the people should not be allowed to choose their own physicians, but have simply labored to shield them from the pernicious influence of empiricism, by exposing the intrigues of quacks, who annoy the public ear, by sounding their own trumpets at the corners of the street, upon the housetops, and through the medium of the press.

"*Second.* We have never permitted any puff of ourself "to be kept as a standing advertisement, for several weeks in such a paper as the *Expositor* is," as these gentlemen have affirmed. The notice taken of our success in practice by our co-editor was without our knowledge, as he himself will testify; nor was it kept standing a solitary week. In this we have another evidence of a want of truthfulness in the statements of these gentlemen.

"Thus far, the article is no defense of either their practice, or their reports. They do not deny that they have treated their patients allopathically, but contend that Hahnemann administered camphor twenty years ago, just as they have administered it during the prevalence of the epidemic. Now, suppose this were even true, would it not convict Hahnemann of treason against the system which he himself originated; for no one, we are sure, will assume that camphor is emetic or cathartic; nor will it be contended, we presume, that camphor, administered in ten or twenty grain doses per hour, is in harmony with their pretensions to infinitesimal dosing. From this dilemma these gentlemen have not attempted to escape. They do not deny that they are in the habit of using the most dangerous articles in the whole list of regular remedies. They even admit that they employ corrosive sublimate, but think it would be impossible to detect it in solution. This they say 'would astonish the chemists,' by which we understand them to affirm, that chemists are ignorant of any method by which to detect this article. Presuming that all are as destitute of chemical knowledge as themselves, they call for our '*modus operandi*' for detecting it. Of a truth, it is hard to believe that any one in this enlightened country would be so totally ignorant of chemical science; but it seems it is so with some who profess to have studied the medical profession, and hence we will give a '*modus operandi*' by which it may be detected, and that, too, without '*astonishing the chemists.*'

"Any of the carbonates of the fixed alkalies, will produce a precipitate of a yellow color, when applied to a solution of corrosive sublimate. Lime water occasions a deep yellow precipitate. Ammonia throws down a white precipitate. These, with perhaps twenty other tests, may be employed to detect the presence of corrosive sublimate; and yet we are told, by these professedly learned medical reformers, who constitute the head and front of homeopathy in this country, that it would '*astonish the chemists*' if any '*modus operandi*' should be discovered for its detection. Now, if these lions of the profession be thus ignorant, what must be the condition of their subalterns, who have to carry their books through the streets, and to the bedside, to enable them to prescribe? Can the people be safe in such hands? or can any one practice, without danger to his patient, who is so totally ignorant of the incompatibles of an agent so dangerous as that of corrosive sublimate? If so, then may these homeopathsists be employed.

"What think you, gentle reader, would be the impression produced upon a court, if these gentlemen, when called to testify in a case of poisoning by corrosive sublimate, should say that it would astonish the chemists were any one to pretend that it could be detected? We vouch for it, there would be laughter long and loud; the court themselves would be compelled to laugh at the top of their voices. Such consummate ignorance in those who pretend that they have studied the regular system of medicine, and that they are graduates of a regular institution, would almost tickle the heart of a stone. And yet there are those in community, who claim to be intelligent, who have lauded them for their high literary and scientific attainments. It has been affirmed a thousand and one times, that they have regular diplomas, and yet they are ignorant of the fact, that corrosive sublimate, which they are in the habit of employing, may be chemically tested. This is learning with a vengeance. Can folly be greater than this, or can ignorance be made more conspicuous? Of what avail are diplomas to pretenders like these? And what must community think, when they are informed that they have thus publicly exposed their ignorance of the profession? Can intelli-

gent people be surprised that the regular profession have been so disgusted with the duplicity of those who have turned aside in pursuit of a phantom, thus presented to their imagination by those who so mercilessly murder the king's English, and who, above all, are in total darkness with respect to the simplest tests in chemical science? We confess we have not language to express the contempt we feel for intelligence like this. If any should think us severe, let them consult some work upon chemistry, and they will have to admit that our comments are just.

"Now, if this communication from Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann is a fair specimen of their high literary and scientific attainments, of which so much has been said by some of the zealous advocates of homeopathy in this city, then, indeed, will the intelligent portion of those who have heretofore employed them, be constrained to acknowledge that they have been grossly deceived.

"In this long article of theirs, what have they said in defense of either their practice or of their bulletin? In their report of cholera cases, which appeared in our issue of August 25, they say: '*We counted among those who died, all which we had attended ourselves, even if we were called at too late a time to be of real use.*' In that bulletin, but two Americans were represented as having died. But as nine cases had been reported to us, we thought it our duty to expose the immorality, promising at the same time to give the names and residences of those who had died in their hands, should it be requested.

"But in their reply to us, they take quite different ground. They now say, they 'have only lost two Americans, which can be *fairly and justly* charged to their account.' This is changing the issue very materially; but we hold them to the original statement, that but 'two Americans had died,' counting all they had attended, 'even when they were *called too late to be of real use,*' for such was the language of their bulletin of August 11.

"With these remarks, we submit the following list of American cases of cholera, which have proved fatal in the hands of Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann, for proof of which we have the most responsible names. We know not how fairly and justly they may be charged to their account, but it is certain, we think, that they attended them at the time of their death.

"*First.* Mr. Chidsey's child, Ninth street, west of the Old Asylum.

"*Second.* Mrs. Trimble, Center street, between Vine and Race.

"*Third.* A child of Mrs. Hudson, Center street, between Vine and Race.

"*Fourth.* Mrs. Reynolds, Front street, near Washington Brewery.

"*Fifth.* Mrs. Martin, Front street, between Ludlow and Lawrence.

"*Sixth.* Mrs. Roberts, Harrison street, east of Broadway.

"*Seventh.* Mrs. Ingalsbe, Race street, between Seventh and Eighth.

"*Eighth.* Nancy Hukill, Third street, between Western Row and John.

"*Ninth.* Mr. Richardson's child, at Mr. Conklin's, Fourth street.

"The above list, we repeat, has been furnished us by responsible individuals."

A REPORT,

READ BEFORE THE HOMEOPATHIC ASSOCIATION OF CINCINNATI, OCT. 1849; BY ALPHONSO TAFT, B. F. BARRETT, GEO. CARLISLE, NATH. L. SAWYER, AND GEO. CRAWFORD.

As elsewhere stated, this is the title of an octavo pamphlet, of forty-eight pages, containing a reply to the editor of the *Expositor*, on the subject of Homeopathic Reports.

In all that is said in this document, but two things are aimed at by the committee :

1st. They attempt to disprove the statement of the editor of the *Expositor*, respecting the nine American cases reported in that paper.

2d. They attempt to disprove the assertion that camphor was used by Homeopaths for the cure of cholera in larger doses than by many of their Allopathic neighbors, or that they practiced Allopathy rather than Homeopathy for the cure of their cholera patients. It would seem, then, that this whole document is designed to settle adversely to us these two points, which involve serious questions of veracity. Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann affirmed in their bulletin that they had lost but two American patients with cholera, and the *Expositor* reported nine who had died in their hands, giving names and residences :

The following is an extract from the Report of the Committee, in reply to the *Expositor*. They say :

“*First.* That in the case of Mr. Chidsey’s child, Dr. Davis, and not Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, was the attending physician. Several physicians, and among them Messrs. Pulte and Ehrmann, were called in consultation.

“*Second.* That Mrs. Trimble was the patient of Dr. Vattier, and not of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann. After her death, however, some of her friends, apprehending that it might be *apparent* only, called in Dr. Pulte, who chanced to be passing by, to see if life was really extinct.

“*Third.* That Mrs. Hudson’s child had been sick with the measles, from which it had partially recovered, not, however, under homeopathic treatment, when cholera symptoms appeared, and Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann were called. The symptoms of cholera were not severe, and were entirely removed within twenty-four hours. But there succeeded a typhoid fever, which, after a course of ten days, terminated fatally.

“*Fourth.* That, in the case of Mrs. Reynolds, the patient had taken allopathic medicines, was in a state of collapse, and had been given up as hopeless, by the allopathic physician who had been first called, and who had declared to her husband that she could not survive an hour, *before* Dr. Pulte was sent for.

“*Fifth.* That Mrs. Martin died on the 12th day of August, just twelve days after the report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann had *closed*, and one day after it was published in the *Cincinnati Gazette*.

"*Sixth.* That Mrs. Roberts is still *alive and well* ; that she *moved* from Harrison street during the prevalence of the epidemic, *but did not die*, as may be ascertained by reference to the lady herself, at the house of Mr. A. J. Brown, on Broadway.

"*Seventh.* That Mrs. Ingalsbe was in a delicate state of health. Dr. Peck was the family physician. Mr. Hill, a neighbor, went for Dr. Peck, who was not at home. He left word for the Doctor to come immediately on his return home, and then went for Dr. Bauer, who was also not at home. He then went for Dr. Pulte, or Ehrmann, and found Dr. Pulte on the street, who arrived at the house not far from seven P. M. ; was informed that Dr. Peck was her physician, but that he could not, at the time, be found. He examined the patient, and gave medicine, informing Mr. Hill, privately, that it was a case of cholera too far gone, he feared, to be cured : that he would be in again soon. In about half an hour he returned with his partner, Dr. Ehrmann, and, after consultation, they gave medicine and left. In about an hour Dr. Peck arrived and took charge of the patient. In half an hour, or an hour after, Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann came again, and, after consultation with Dr. Peck, left, Dr. Peck remaining. This was near ten, P. M. The lady died between two and three the next morning. It is fair to state that the lady was in a collapsed state when Dr. Pulte first arrived.

"*Eighth.* That Mrs. Hukill was first taken with dysentery, about twelve days before her death ; was treated by Dr. Ehrmann, and in four or five days got better, and the doctor ceased to visit her. After two or three days, that is to say, on the Thursday night preceding the Monday on which she died, she was taken with a diarrhea, and the doctor was again called. He regarded her symptoms as tending to cholera, though not then severe. She had no nausea, nor cramps, nor any violent symptoms. So she continued without perceptible change, till late on Saturday night, when she began to feel sick at the stomach, and vomited. The family immediately sent to Dr. Ehrmann for medicine, informing him of the change in her symptoms. He prepared sixteen powders, directing that one be taken every fifteen or twenty minutes, until the symptoms should be checked. Of these powders the patient took but two or three, refusing to take more. Early in the morning, at about the break of day, Dr. Ehrmann was sent for, but did not go. He inquired if the powders had been taken, and was told they had not, when he again directed that the powders be given. At eight or nine o'clock, A. M., Dr. Lawson was called in ; but he said she was too far gone to be cured, and gave no medicine. Dr. Ehrmann came at about ten or eleven o'clock, A. M., and found his package of powders on the table, and the patient in a state of collapse, which, considering her age and general health, rendered her case hopeless. The doctor, however, left medicine, which she took. She died about seven, A. M., on Monday. She was about fifty-seven years of age, and was enfeebled by chronic disease.

"*Ninth.* The ninth case referred to by the Rev. Dr. Latta, is that of Mr. Richardson's child. The evidence is that the child died not of cholera, but of dropsy on the brain.

"Such your committee have found the facts to be, in relation to the *nine deaths* by cholera charged by Dr. Latta against Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann. These facts were obtained from the surviving relatives and friends, and attending physicians, and in the case of Mrs. Roberts, from herself."

The above is an abstract from the report of the committee, of all the facts material to the issues in the case. And although at first sight they may seem to invalidate, in part, the report of the Expositor, the reverse will appear, as each individual case is examined in connection with the detail of facts in the bulletin of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, who claim to have lost none of any other form of disease, during the same time they were in attendance

upon the eleven hundred and sixteen cases of cholera : and to have lost none of their cholera patients — “ *even where they were called TOO LATE to be of any real use,*” except the two Americans and thirty-three Germans named in their bulletin. The reader will therefore bear these two facts in mind, while we proceed to a patient investigation of this report.

The committee decide adversely to us with respect to three of the cases reported in the Expositor ; but their examination of the case was strictly *ex parte*, from first to last, and, therefore, entitled to no higher consideration than that made to us by six responsible individuals, on whose authority the statements were founded. The names of our reporters were given to the committee, and yet some of them, to say no more, were not even called upon by these gentlemen. Had the opposite party been consulted, other facts might have been obtained, quite the reverse of those upon which the report was founded ; but such was not the course adopted by the committee, and hence neither we nor the persons reporting to us were summoned to the investigation of a single case.

Does Mr. Taft, who is himself a lawyer, suppose that we are bound to attach any more importance to this kind of *ex parte* investigation than to the statements of the six responsible men, who vouch for the correctness of our report ? Or can any one believe that we should discredit the testimony of six responsible persons, even though they might be contradicted by five others equally responsible ? Surely not. But such is not the case in the instance before us. With respect to seven cases out of the nine, there is in fact no serious disagreement. The committee report that one of the nine was dead before Dr. Pulte was called, and we have no doubt they were so informed by Dr. Pulte, perhaps by others ; but they may have been imposed upon, as they were very likely to be by an *ex parte* investigation. A second person of the nine is said to be yet alive, but, as the persons who reported to us were not consulted, it is possible, we think, that the committee have fallen upon another individual of the same name. A third person, named in the Expositor, is said by the committee to have died in the hands of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, one day after their bulletin was published. In this we presume they are correct, and hence we will allow them the benefit of the date, while we hold them strictly responsible for the case.

The remaining six cases, according to the showing of the committee themselves, are stated correctly in the Expositor. It avails them nothing to say that this or that case terminated in dis-

ease of the brain or typhoid fever ; nor does it avail them anything to say that this or that case was in the hands of allopathic physicians until past cure, or that the patient was in a state of collapse when they were called in, because Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann in their report, say that they “ ACCOUNTED AMONG THOSE WHO DIED ALL WHICH THEY HAD ATTENDED, EVEN IF THEY WERE CALLED AT TOO LATE A TIME TO BE OF REAL USE.” Language could not be stronger—the cases could not be more extreme or desperate than those they profess to have counted, not even excepting the lady to whom they are said to have been called after she was dead. Let us, then, with this language in view, proceed to notice more particularly the individual cases examined by the Homeopathic committee.

1. In the case of Mr. Chidsey’s child, the committee attempt to release Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann from all responsibility by alleging that Dr. Davis, a Homeopathist, was the family physician. But, alas ! they have to admit that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann were called in ; and, although it may have been “ *too late to be of any real use,*” they were nevertheless responsible for the case, in that they affirm in their bulletin that all such cases were counted.

2. The committee admit that the child of Mrs. Hudson had the cholera, and that Drs. Pulte and Ehrman attended it ; but they allege that the disease terminated in typhoid fever, and that therefore the child did not die of cholera. With all due respect for the opinions of the committee, we beg leave to assure them that the primary affection is that which should have been reported, let it assume what form it might in the sequel. But were we even to admit that this patient died of nervous or typhoid fever, still the committee will have failed to acquit Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann of misrepresentation ; because, in their report, they affirm that during the same time they had “ 1,350 cases of mixed character,” such as “ rumbling in the bowels,” “ dysentery,” also “ nervous fever with typhoid tendency ;” but of these they say “ they lost none.” Of what avail, then, is it to these gentlemen or the committee to assert that this patient died of typhoid fever ? since they declared with equal boldness that they lost none with typhoid fever, during the period embraced in their report. Now, if in this Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann have stated the truth, does it not follow that this patient died of cholera, and not of typhoid fever, as assumed by the committee ? We leave the gentlemen to settle this seeming contradiction among themselves as best they may.

3. The committee admit that Mrs. Reynolds died of cholera, in

the hands of Dr. Pulte, but labor to excuse the Dr.'s want of success, by alledging that she was in a collapsed state when he was called. In this the committee are mistaken. We have proof positive that she was in the hands of Dr. Pulte from first to last, and that he pronounced her better some two hours before her death. Moreover we can prove that she never swallowed a regular dose of medicine from an allopathic physician. The facts of the case are these : Mrs. Reynolds, after having read the extravagant reports of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann in May, was induced to rely upon them in the event she should be taken with the cholera. She made known her wishes to her husband, who strictly complied with her request. She thought that the regular profession could hardly be expected to cure one hundred cases without the loss of one, as these gentlemen had reported ; supposing of course that their report was true, she made a resolve to employ them, and yet she died. And now, not content with having deceived the woman to the death, there is still a further attempt to deceive the community with respect to her case, than which nothing can be more *iniquitous*. We make these statements upon the authority of those who know, and upon the authority of one who administered all the medicines which were given ; than whom no one is entitled to greater confidence.

4. The committee admit that Mrs. Martin died of cholera, under the treatment of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, but maintain that her death occurred after they had closed their report—which may be true, but still the case was theirs.

5. The committee admit that Mrs. Engalsbe died of cholera, and after making a long talk about Dr. Peck, as the family physician, they have to concede at last that Dr. Pulte was first called to the case—that at a subsequent visit he took with him his partner, Dr. Ehrmann—that at a still later period Dr. Peck arrived, and they say took charge of the patient ; but of what avail was this, when, according to their own showing, Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann continued in attendance ? Moreover, they admit that the patient was in a state of collapse before the arrival of Dr. Peck ; and yet strangely enough, they would have the public believe that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann were not responsible for the case, although they were in attendance upon it from beginning to end, with the assistance of Dr. Peck. Surely these gentlemen were hard pushed for a resort.

6. About the case of Mrs. Hukill, who died in the hands of Dr. Ehrmann, the committee themselves do not appear to be in doubt.

They give quite a lengthy history of the case, speak of the call of Dr. Lawson to the patient, and of sundry other matters calculated to obscure the subject, but after all, they have to admit that Dr. Lawson refused to prescribe, and that the patient died under the treatment of Dr. Ehrmann.

7. The child of Mr. Richardson is said by the committee to have died of dropsy on the brain, and not of cholera. This, however, we are not prepared to concede without further investigation. But suppose we were to admit it, did not this death occur within the time specified in the report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, and is it not to be numbered among the "1,350 cases of mixed character" of which they declared "they lost none?"

Of what use, then, is it to the committee to multiply cases of this sort, which while they lessen the misrepresentation of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann with respect to the number of persons who died in their hands of cholera, increase the number of cases who died under their treatment of nervous or typhoid fever, of which they affirm with equal boldness that they "lost none." The question is not (as these gentlemen would have it understood) whether there were strictly nine cases, as represented by the Expositor, but it is whether there were more cases than were reported by Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann. The showing of nine cases by the Expositor might have been inaccurate, because those who furnished them might have been mistaken; but still this would not acquit Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann; should they be found at fault on the score of accuracy with respect to a single case; because they affirm, not of the statements of others, but of patients whom they themselves had personally attended. It is not, therefore, important that we should establish the nine cases referred to above, in order to convict Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann of misrepresentation in saying that two Americans only had died of cholera in their hands. It is only necessary to establish the fact, that more than two Americans were lost under their treatment, in order to invalidate their report; and this we have done beyond dispute, according to the showing of the committee themselves. The sudden disappearance of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, and the appearance of these distinguished gentlemen who have taken their place at the bidding of the Society, indicates clearly enough that they have superior claims upon the confidence of the Society, which was formed avowedly for the defense of their Doctors, and the advancement of the system of Homeopathy.

It might be inferred that Mr. Taft, who is a distinguished lawyer,

and Mr. Barrett a celebrated pulpit orator in the Swedenborgian church, would not assume a position in the medical profession unless they were duly authorized to do so by some regularly chartered medical institution in this or some other country; but we assure our readers that neither of these gentlemen have any claims to public confidence on the score of competency in the investigation of medical subjects; and we most solemnly protest against their claims to disinterestedness as witnesses, and to their right of umpirage in the case. The manner of their appointment, the *ex parte* investigation which they have instituted, and the special pleading of their report, clearly demonstrates that they are zealous partisans, whose object is to defend the report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann as best they may. And yet, with all their zeal and earnestness, they have been compelled, as their report will fully attest, to admit the correctness of our statement with respect to six cases out of the nine, to which we may safely add one of the two reported by Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, which is said to have been a young man, as no young man can be found in the list we have furnished, which will make in all, seven American cases, justly chargeable to Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, instead of two.

But why did the committee limit their investigation to nine cases only? Were there not other nine Americans, and nearly sixty Germans, reported through a public journal of this city before the issue of their report? And were not the committee importuned by the editor of the Expositor to withhold their pamphlet until they were in possession of all the cases which could be obtained? And did he not pledge himself to render them all the assistance in his power? Let the following extract answer. In reply to the announcement of the committee that a pamphlet would be forthcoming, the editor of the Expositor informed them, through the "Commercial," that nine new American cases had already been discovered, and that others would doubtless be reported soon. The following was his language:

"We hope the committee will continue their investigation, and withhold the forthcoming pamphlet until they shall have obtained all the information which may be necessary to enable them to put forth an enlightened report; and we pledge ourself to render them all the assistance in our power on the score of statistics. Having been absent from the city a few weeks, we have not been able to do as much in this way as they might have desired, but still we have a few additional cases of American patients, who died of cholera in the hands of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, during the late epidemic, with which the committee must be satisfied for the present; and perhaps by the time they have investigated these, we may have more to report. They are as follows:

1. Mrs. Andress, Sixth street, north side, near Mound.

- 2 and 3. Mr. Black's wife and child, Sycamore street, near Franklin.
4. Mrs. Reddington, Homeopathic Doctress.
- 5 and 6. Mr. Ennis and Mrs. Lock, Seventh st., north side, 4 doors above Linn.
7. John M. C. Krider, Main st., west side, bet. 5th and 6th.
8. Mrs. Enis, Seventh st., just above Linn.
9. Mrs. Banks, Kemble st., between Western Row and John.

The above nine American cases, have all been reported to us by responsible individuals, and hence we have no reason to doubt the correctness of the report. We have also a list of some fifty or sixty German patients who are said to have died of cholera in the hands of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, including a few Irish; but as the list is very lengthy, we will not publish it until called for by the Homeopathic committee, at which time we may be able to give them more."

With all these assurances, and with the above nine new American and from fifty to sixty German cases before their eyes, this committee issued their report in pamphlet form, without the slightest reference to either, and without an apology for their delinquency. They seem to have become weary in well doing, or what is by far more probable, they discovered that it was utterly impossible to defend the exaggerated report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, and therefore left these gentlemen to their fate. Add to these the seven cases made out by the committee, and three which have since been reported to us, and we have in all nineteen Americans, and nearly sixty Germans who are reported to have died of cholera in the hands of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, who so unblushingly declared that they had lost but two Americans and thirty-three Germans. The silence of the committee with respect to all these cases, save only the nine first reported, affords proof, clear and convincing, that they were afraid of the issue and of the result. There is too much intelligence in the committee not to have perceived the danger to which they themselves would have been exposed by further efforts to screen these gentlemen from public scorn, for the daring attempt they had made to deceive in a matter so vitally important to the community, both with respect to health and life. But let us examine, a little more closely, the statements of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, as set forth in this report.

Not content with the monstrous declaration that they had treated eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients in ninety days, losing but two Americans out of four hundred and seventy-four, and but thirty-three Germans out of six hundred and forty-two patients, they go right on to say, that they treated, during the same time, "thirteen hundred and fifty cases of mixed character, and a great number of dysenteries, and also a good many nervous fevers with typhoid tendency," of which they say they lost none. Now suppose these cases of dysenteries and typhoid fever were

equal to the cases of mixed character, which is probably a fair presumption, it would make in all four thousand and fifty patients, each of which would probably have required, on an average, two visits every twenty-four hours, which would have made the whole number of visits, eight thousand one hundred. The eleven hundred and sixteen cholera patients must have required attention at least to the amount of six visits every twenty-four hours, which would amount to six thousand six hundred and ninety-six visits to their cholera patients. Add these to the number of visits to mixed cases, cases of dysentery, nervous fever, etc., and we have the enormous sum total of fourteen thousand seven hundred and ninety-six visits in ninety days; and when, in addition to all this, we take into the account the time spent in attention to obstetrical business and the sale of cholera preventives in their office, which probably employed one-third of all their time, we think there can be but little doubt that they were kept comfortably busy, to say no more: For we are sure no ten physicians can do the amount of business involved in this calculation. And of this we have proof in the startling fact revealed in the report of the committee, that ten other Homeopathic doctors do not, in all, report as many cholera patients as Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, and yet all, we presume, were constantly employed.

The committee say, that they "presume that Dr. Latta will promptly correct what he finds to be incorrect in his published statements of this subject"—that "his error consisted in giving too ready heed to those rumors, which are always rife in times of terror and alarm"—"that such subjects should be examined with some degree of charity, and some grains of allowance for human infirmity," etc. The truth of the last statement we cheerfully admit, and we are fully prepared to make allowance by the pound; but even then we could not have spared the report of these gentlemen. Nor were we misled by rumor. The persons reporting to us, alledged that they were personally cognizant of the facts. It is true, that we did not have the parties summoned to a formal investigation. Nor did the committee themselves adopt a formality of process with respect to the nine cases reported by the Expositor. They inquired individually, we are told, of A, B, and C, if these things were so, and reported accordingly; and hence they might have spared themselves the trouble of admonishing others of the impropriety of relying upon rumor. They admit, moreover, that the facts upon which they found their report were, partly obtained from the "*attending physicians*," who, of course,

would not be at fault in making good the story. "These facts (say the committee) were obtained from the surviving relatives, and friends, and *attending physicians*." It is novel, indeed, that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann should have been called upon as witnesses, in a case in which they themselves were the accused? And yet such seems to have been the policy adopted, and hence it is not at all surprising that some of the persons are said to have been dead before they were called, and that others are reported still alive. In view of this fact, it will not be difficult, we think, for the reader to perceive that no reliance can be placed upon the report of the committee, because the investigation, it will be seen, was not only *ex parte*, but the very persons against whom the charges were urged by the Expositor, were allowed to testify in favor of themselves, and in the absence of the opposite party; and, consequently, a verdict of not guilty with the committee, would be the natural result. But such will not be the verdict of community. We do not charge upon them intentional wrong, as it is possible that Mr. Taft, Mr. Barrett, and the other members of the committee who were not accustomed to the investigation of medical subjects, may have supposed that the testimony of the accused was even better than that of others less interested in the matter. The legal member of the committee knew, of course, that in ordinary cases, testimony of this sort would not be admissible; but as this was a matter of dispute among doctors, he probably supposed that it was an exception to the general laws of evidence. This, to say the least, was exceedingly liberal on the part of the judges in the case, who, according to another principle of law, are always supposed to be on the side of the criminal.

But to be serious, nothing, it seems to us, could be more ridiculously absurd than to found a report upon the testimony of interested persons, as in the instance now under consideration.

In concluding their remarks on this point, the committee say: "If the editor of the Expositor had established his nine cases against Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, it would have availed him and his cause but little, in that reports of like success are coming from every city and county where Homeopathy has been tried." Now if this be true, it would only establish the fact that no reliance can be placed on the reports of Homeopaths, for surely, nothing can be clearer than that Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann are greatly at fault on the score of accuracy, both with respect to the number they attended, and the number who died in their hands.

In further proof of this, we invite the attention of the reader to the following calculation :

If Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann had eleven hundred and sixteen cases of cholera in ninety days, how many cases would there have been, provided all the other practitioners in the city, amounting in all to about two hundred, had attended each as many as either of these gentlemen, which is no doubt the fact, for the reason that all, as everybody knows, were busily employed during the cholera. According to this calculation, there would have been in this city in ninety days, one hundred and eleven thousand six hundred cases of cholera. In addition to this, suppose that all the others had each as many mixed cases, and as many cases of dysentery, and nervous fever, with typhoid tendency, how many of our citizens would have been sick during the ninety days specified in their report? Their mixed cases amounted to thirteen hundred and fifty. Now suppose the cases of dysentery and typhous fever were equal in number to the mixed cases—which is a fair presumption—it would make, in all, four thousand and fifty cases. If each of the two hundred physicians, above alluded to, had as many in proportion, it would make four hundred and fifteen thousand. Add to these, one hundred and eleven thousand, six hundred cholera cases, and we have the enormous sum total, of five hundred and sixteen thousand, six hundred patients in ninety days. But suppose there should chance to be a mistake of a hundred in the number of practitioners. It would only reduce the whole number of patients one half, which would still leave two hundred and fifty-eight thousand, three hundred patients, whereas there are but one hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants within the range of the city practice. This calculation, it will be seen, proves conclusively, if Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann's report be true, that during the time they specified, every citizen, young and old, were sick, either of cholera, dysentery, typhous fever, "*rumbling in the bowels,*" or some other disease of mixed character, and that there were one hundred and eight thousand three hundred cases beside. If the reader can believe this, it may, in truth, be said of him, "great is thy faith."

We greatly wonder that non-professional gentlemen should attempt the discussion of the comparative merit of two systems of medical practice, neither of which they are supposed to have studied. And it is a matter of still greater surprise, that Mr. Taft, who sustains a high position in the legal profession, should have hazarded his standing by an attempt to act the doctor as in the

report now under consideration, which is said to have issued from his pen. Indeed, it would seem, from the tenor and tone of the report, that he and the other gentlemen with whom he is associated, have come to the deliberate conclusion that the people must take in hand the reform of medical theories. They admit that, "the mass of mankind may not be able to decide whose theory is most logical, but they are competent (they affirm) to appreciate the results of medical practice, when plainly and fairly stated." To this we agree; but our learned committee are obviously not content to judge of the result of medical practice, and say to their physicians, stand aside, and let we, the people, discuss the claims of the different systems. Now if the people are competent to the task of reforming the regular system of medicine, why not take in hand the reform of the profession of law? Would the legal member of the committee consent? Why not? It is not half so difficult to acquire a knowledge of law as of medicine, nor yet so dangerous to community, should the legal pretender be ignorant of the profession, because money is at stake in the one case, and life in the other. There is no member of the medical profession, we are sure, who might not, with as much propriety, attempt to act the lawyer, as that Mr. Taft, and the other non-professional gentlemen, composing the committee, should claim the right of umpirage with respect to the comparative claims of different systems of medicine.

The people can doubtless judge correctly of the success of medical practitioners, when not deceived by false representations, and are fully competent to choose their own physicians, but we doubt whether many can be found so arrogant as to assume to know more with respect to medicine than those who have devoted their lives to the study and practice of the profession: Hence we reckon the converts of the committee will be few. All men of common sense, and a moderate share of observation, will readily perceive that physicians can have no interest in rejecting any set of remedies, or any system of practice, which would enable them to succeed in the cure of maladies, because their own reputation depends upon their success. In view of this fact, and this alone, it must be obvious to all that they would be first to avail themselves of the best means of cure, be it Homeopathy, or any other pathy now agitating the public mind.

There are not many, we suppose, who can be induced by this committee to believe, that the regular profession are knaves, who knowingly practice a system which they themselves consider infe-

rior to others, or that they are less competent than the people to judge of the comparative merits of the different theories of practice.

We will now proceed to notice the arguments by which these gentlemen attempt to refute the second charge urged by the Expositor against Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, viz., that of using allopathic treatment for the cure of cholera. They alledge, first, that camphor, according to Hahnemann, is a homeopathic remedy for the disease. But their reasoning is not only in violation of the rule of Hahnemann, for testing the Homeopathic action of medicines, but it is also in violation of the rule which they themselves have adopted.

First. Hahnemann prescribed "*moderate doses*" of medicines, and his practice was in harmony with the rule. It reads as follows: "There is no safer, or more natural method of discovering the effects of medicine on the health of man (says Hahnemann) than by trying them separately and singly, in MODERATE DOSES, upon healthy individuals, and observing what changes they create in the moral and physical state; that is to say, what elements of disease these substances are capable of producing." Here, then, is the rule laid down by Hahnemann. (See Organon, page 191.)

The very first experiment which he is said to have made, was "while engaged in translating the *Materia Medica* of the illustrious Cullen, in 1790, in which the febrifuge virtues of Cinchona bark are described, he became fired with a desire of ascertaining its mode of action. While in the enjoyment of the most robust state of health, he commenced the use of this substance, and in a short time was attacked with all the symptoms of intermittent fever, similar, in every respect, to those which that medicine is known to cure. Being struck, it is said, with the identity of the two diseases, he immediately divined the great truth which has become the foundation of the new medical doctrine of Homeopathy." (See Organon.)

To transcend the regular dose in one instance, and fall below it in another, in an attempt to discover the legitimate homeopathic action of medicine, would be ridiculously absurd. In the instance above he was himself the subject of experiment, and, of course, he did not take the medicine in "immoderate or poisonous doses," but in the size doses for which it was administered by allopathic physicians for the cure of intermittent fever. And of this we have additional proof in the trials subsequently made with the sulphate of quinine, which he affirms he adminis-

tered in grain doses three times a day, until all the symptoms of intermittent fever were produced.

It is therefore clearly established, that it was a rule with Hahnemann not to administer medicine beyond the regular allopathic dose in order to arrive at its true homeopathic uses. Indeed, it would seem that he usually relied upon less than the regular dose, as was natural enough, especially, when he himself was the subject of experiment.

Such was the rule, and such the practice of the founder, which, while they harmonize one with the other, never did and never will produce the results ascribed to them by that gentleman. That bark, or quinine, administered to persons in health, as indicated by his rule and practice, will never produce the symptoms of intermitting fever, is absolutely certain; for we have known them employed for months, in even larger doses, without producing a solitary symptom of that disease. That Hahnemann may have taken an intermitting fever while experimenting with the medicine, is admitted; but that the effect was not justly chargeable to the remedies he employed, is as easily demonstrated as that three and two are five. And we challenge the advocates of the system to an investigation of the fact by experiment, in harmony with the rule and practice of Hahnemann. Now, as this trial with quinine is that which gave birth to the system, and is that upon which it is founded, it is important to all believers in Homeopathy to test the truth of the declaration, that it is capable of producing all the symptoms of intermitting fever, and then they will see that the system was false in its inception, that it is false in its facts and reasonings, and that it will be perpetually false in its results.

Be this, however, as it may, we think the reader will perceive that Hahnemann not only prescribed but practiced the rule which requires MODERATE DOSES of medicines to be given to persons in health, for the purpose of proving their homeopathic uses, or in other words, for the purpose of elucidating the proposition, *Similia Similibus Curantur*. Having established this point, we will next proceed to show that the committee, instead of adhering to this rule, adopted one of their own, which requires that medicines should be given to persons in health in "LARGE DOSES," for the purpose of establishing the same proposition.

The following is their rule, which we find in italics in the report: "The first question (they say), is whether these remedies administered in LARGE DOSES to persons in health, would pro-

duce symptoms similar to those of the cholera in the several stages of it, for which they are respectively administered.” The reader will readily perceive that this is not only in conflict with the practice and rule adopted by Hahnemann, but that their reasoning is founded upon a rule differing from both; for in essaying to prove that camphor and other medicines named are Homeopathic remedies for cholera, they predicate their reasoning of “IMMODERATE OR POISONOUS DOSES” of medicine. In proof of which we invite the attention of the reader to the following extract from their report :

“But your committee have thought it due to the opponents of Homeopathy, to look into their books, that, if they have given any testimony on the subject, that testimony may not be lost. The first medicine to be tried, is camphor. The ‘United States Dispensatory,’ a standard work in Allopathy, which has gone through eight editions, and the authority of which will not be disputed by any regular physician, gives the following account of the medical properties and uses of camphor: ‘In large doses, it displays a more decided action on the brain, producing more or less *giddiness* and mental confusion, with a disposition to sleep.’ ‘In immoderate doses, it occasions *nausea, vomiting, anxiety, faintness, vertigo, delirium, insensibility, coma, and convulsions, which may end in death.*’—*U. S. Dispensatory*, p. 157, 8th Ed.

“If to the above symptoms, be added what the patient provings of Homeopathy have long since established, viz: ‘*involuntary diarrhea*’ and *coldness of the extremities*, we have a vivid picture of cholera itself, in its first and second stages.”

Now, from the above, it will be seen that the Dispensatory is not quoted on the subject of “MODERATE DOSES,” which would indicate the homeopathic action of camphor, in harmony with the rule of Hahnemann, but the quotation commences with the effects of “LARGE DOSES,” in harmony with the rule of the committee; and there it might have been expected to stop, but, it seems, it does not. These gentlemen, finding that camphor, in large doses, was incapable of producing anything more than “giddiness, mental confusion, and a disposition to sleep,” readily enough perceived that the Dispensatory never could help them out, in harmony with the rule adopted by themselves; and hence, they abandon the rule and appeal to the Dispensatory for proof that camphor, in “IMMODERATE DOSES,” would produce the “symptoms of cholera.” And what of all this? Does it prove anything in favor of an assumption which is predicated of “LARGE DOSES” of medicines. In immoderate doses, even buttermilk, molasses, sweet potatoes, or cabbage, might produce many, if not all, the symptoms ascribed to immoderate doses of camphor; and, therefore, according to the reasoning of this committee, buttermilk, molasses, sweet potatoes, and, above all, cabbage, are true homeopathic remedies for cholera. It is ridiculous enough to appeal to

“immoderate doses” of medicine, as a rule, for testing their homeopathic action, and yet such is the resort of the committee. We admonish the reader to beware, lest he be made the subject of experiments for establishing a system which requires the actual poisoning of some, in order to discover suitable remedies for the cure of others; for we are very sure that there are not many in community who would volunteer to take poisonous, or “IM-MODERATE” doses of medicine, for the sake of establishing the fanatical delusion indicated by the phrase, “*similia similibus curantur.*” The cholera would, indeed, be a very harmless thing, if it developed no other symptoms than those ascribed in the Dispensatory, to “LARGE DOSES” of camphor, which is nothing more or less than “GIDDINESS AND MENTAL CONFUSION, WITH A DISPOSITION TO SLEEP.” Now, if these are the symptoms of cholera, then is camphor a homeopathic remedy for that disease, if the rule adopted by the committee be correct; but that they are not, every man of common sense must know, who has ever seen a case; and, therefore, according to the authority they themselves have introduced, and according to their own rule of interpretation, which limits the resemblance to that of “*large doses*,” camphor is not a homeopathic remedy for cholera.

But again. The committee, after having quoted from the Dispensatory, what is said of the effects of “IMMODERATE DOSES” of camphor, finding that even this did not come up to the standard of cholera, coldness, cramps, and diarrhea, not being named, rendering the resemblance very imperfect, proceed to add “*involuntary diarrhea and coldness of the extremities as the result of the patient provings of homeopathy*,” declaring in the end, that they “have a vivid picture of cholera itself.” But, in this, they are quite mistaken, for, with all the addition which the “patient provings of Homeopathy” have made, cramps are still wanting, which mars the resemblance very materially, because, cramps are among the most prominent symptoms of the disease. It will take still further “provings of Homeopathy,” to bring out this very important feature in the resemblance. Immoderate doses have not developed cramps; the “*further provings of Homeopathy*,” which, of course, required MORE than an “IMMODERATE DOSE,” have not developed them; and, hence, the dose must still be increased, or the theory of the committee must fall to the ground. Who, of the advocates of the doctrine, will volunteer as victims to the cause? What brave knight will come to the rescue? Better that one suffer than many. It is possible that “Young Physic,” the dreamy correspondent of

the "Times," could be induced to become the martyr to a system for which he has already made sacrifices of the most painful and delicate character. But to be serious, we have never seen anything more palpably absurd, than the statements and reasoning of this report. And yet, in the close of this miserable attempt to disprove the statements of the Expositor, touching the use of camphor by the Homeopathists, they wind up with a flourish, "That the assertion of the learned Doctor, that no one, he was sure, would assume that camphor was emetic and cathartic, was not well considered."

But what proof, may we ask, have these gentlemen produced in support of their assumption, that camphor is emetic or cathartic? Nothing, surely, except their own affirmation that it is a remedy for cholera, which they essay to prove by an appeal to the United States Dispensatory. And now that they "have appealed to Cæsar, to Cæsar they must go." We are more than willing to abide the decisions of the Dispensatory.

First. Hahnemann, it will be recollected, adopted a rule which requires "MODERATE DOSES" of medicine to be given to persons in health to test their homeopathic action. Let us see, then, whether the symptoms produced by "MODERATE DOSES" of camphor, as detailed, are analogous to those of cholera. It is assumed by the Dispensatory, and it is no doubt true, that "the effects of medicine vary with the quantity administered." Camphor, in "moderate doses," "produces, in a healthy individual, mental exhilaration, increased heat of skin, and occasional diaphoresis," or perspiration. Is there anything, in these symptoms, analogous to the symptoms of cholera? On the contrary, are they not exactly the reverse? That there is no "exhilaration," and no "heat of the skin" in cholera, everybody must admit, who have ever been cognizant of a case; and hence, the symptoms produced by a "MODERATE DOSE" of camphor are not only wanting in resemblance to those of cholera, but they are directly the reverse; and therefore, according to the rule of Hahnemann and the United States Dispensatory, to both of which these gentlemen appeal, camphor is not emetic or cathartic, and of course not a homeopathic remedy for that disease, as assumed in the report.

Second. The committee assume that LARGE DOSES of medicine should be given to persons in health, to prove their homeopathic action; and appeal to the United States Dispensatory in proof of the assumption that camphor, in LARGE DOSES, produces all the symptoms of cholera. Well, let us see if even

in this the Dispensatory will sustain them. "In large doses," says this authority, "it displays a more decided action on the brain, producing more or less giddiness and mental confusion, with a disposition to sleep, and in morbid states of the system, relieving pain and allaying spasmodic action." From this it will be seen, that camphor is not only incapable, even in "LARGE DOSES," of producing any of the prominent symptoms of cholera, but that in "LARGE DOSES" it actually "allays spasmodic action," showing most conclusively that it produces symptoms directly the reverse of those of cholera; and hence we are fully sustained in the assumption that camphor is not a homeopathic remedy for that disease. It must be obvious, then, we think, to every intelligent reader, that neither the rule of Hahnemann, nor that adopted by the committee themselves, will bear them out in the assertion, that, according to the showing of the Dispensatory, camphor is a homeopathic remedy for cholera. Indeed, of this they themselves seem to be conscious, and hence their appeal to the effects of "IMMODERATE DOSES" of this and the other medicines named in proof of their assumption, which resort, as elsewhere proved, is equally abortive, in that camphor, even in "IMMODERATE DOSES," is incapable of producing all the symptoms of the disease. We repeat, therefore, what we affirmed at first, that no one at all acquainted with the effects of camphor, would assume that it is either emetic or cathartic. In conclusion, it will be perceived,

First. That the rule of Hahnemann has been abandoned by the committee.

Second. That their own rule has also been abandoned; and finally, when they have appealed to "immoderate doses," in violation of all rule, they have still failed to disprove the charge of the Expositor, that Homeopaths resorted to allopathic treatment for the cure of cholera.

But, as the last resort, the committee say, that Hahnemann recommended camphor for the treatment of that disease. And what if he did? Have we not proved that his own rule limited him to the use of "MODERATE DOSES" of medicine in proving their homeopathic action? And have we not proved by the United States Dispensatory, to which these gentlemen themselves have appealed for evidence, that camphor, in moderate doses, produces symptoms precisely the reverse of cholera? Of what avail, then, is it to refer to the fact, that Hahnemann recommended camphor for the disease? This fact, if established, while it would afford

no proof of the assumption of the committee, would only serve to render ridiculous the system itself; because, according to their own showing, and the rule of Hahnemann, there is no resemblance between the effects of camphor, in "MODERATE DOSES," and the symptoms of cholera. The committee have not only failed to sustain this assumption of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, but it will be seen that the whole thing is a humbug, from first to last. They have utterly failed to acquit Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann of the charges urged by the Expositor, and they make no attempt to sustain the assumption of these gentlemen, that "the chemists would be astonished" to learn that there was a test, "for corrosive sublimate." But again, they charge the editor of the Expositor with mortal offense, for saying, as they alledge, "that two drops of camphor every five minutes was equal to from fifteen to twenty grains every hour." We beg to assure them, however, that in this their labor is lost, as we never affirmed, as charged by the committee. It was said that we had known them to administer from three to five drops every three minutes, and that in this way from fifteen to twenty grains of camphor were administered every hour.

These gentlemen, after quoting from several authors what is said of the treatment of cholera, and not finding camphor mentioned as a remedy, conclude, therefore, that camphor had never been used by allopathic physicians until recommended by Hahnemann in 1829. They say: "We have seen no evidence whatever, that any one of the remedies, recommended by him, had ever been used in cholera, unless, perhaps, we ought to except the declaration of Dr. Latta in the article under consideration, 'that it is known to community that regular physicians have always relied upon camphor.'"

It is quite logical, we suppose, in the estimation of these distinguished laymen, to infer that because in the half dozen books they consulted, no mention is made of camphor, that, therefore, it had not been used by the regular profession. And suppose it was true, that fifty authors had failed to give any account of camphor as a remedy for that disease, would this afford proof that it had never been employed by the regular profession? The Expositor affirmed that camphor had always been relied upon, to a considerable extent, for the cure of cholera; but the committee declare that Elliottson, Watson, Dunglison, and some three or four others, make no mention of camphor in the treatment of the disease, and, therefore, they conclude, that camphor has never been used by the

regular profession. Nay, more, it is proof positive, in their estimation, that it was never even named prior to 1829, "unless (say the committee) we ought, perhaps, to except the declaration of Dr. Latta, that it is known to community, that physicians have always relied upon camphor." This is, indeed, logic with a vengeance. It is, however, precisely the kind which might have been expected from gentlemen wholly unacquainted with the investigation of medical subjects. But is it a fact, that camphor was never employed by the regular profession until recommended by Hahnemann in 1829? We affirm it is not. It was used in India, in the treatment of cholera, as early, at least, as 1818. (See notice of Bell's Quarterly Reviewer, in the Medico Chirurgical Review, vol. x, page 193, in which it is said, the "bleeding, leeching, cupping, and stimulants, such as opium, ether, CAMPHOR, ammonia, peppermint, brandy, and calomel, are the chief means" employed for the cure of cholera. Here, then, we have proof positive, that the statement of the committee that Hahnemann was the first to recommend camphor for the cure of cholera in 1829, is utterly untrue; and we leave these modest laymen to all the self-gratulation which they may be able to derive from the swaggering announcement that they "ought, perhaps, to except the declaration of Dr. Latta," etc. It would indeed have been fortunate for them, had they excepted "the declarations" of many others also. But in this, as in other instances, the committee are, no doubt, indebted to their doctors for the ridiculous blunder they have made, which will probably teach them a lesson that may prevent them in future from meddling with subjects they do not understand. But had it even been true, as affirmed by the committee, that Hahnemann was the first to recommend camphor in the cure of this disease, it would still not be true that the Expositor was at fault in saying, that the *community* were apprized "that regular physicians had always relied upon it to a considerable extent," because the remark was not predicated of any period prior to the appearance of the cholera in this "community," to whose knowledge of the use of camphor the appeal was made. The idea was prominent in the mind of the writer that in the year 1832-3 it was extensively employed by the regulars, although Homeopathy was not known in this community, and hence, the community were appealed to for the truth of the assertion.

Having now established the fact, beyond dispute, that camphor is not a homeopathic remedy for the cholera, and that it was

chiefly relied upon by Homeopaths, for the cure of that disease, as is clearly admitted in this report, does it not follow, therefore, as an irresistible conclusion, that their success, so far as they had any, was justly attributable to allopathic treatment, rather than to Homeopathy. But, in concluding our remarks upon this point, we wish to direct the attention of the reader to the two following questions. We have seen in the progress of this investigation, that camphor was chiefly relied upon by the Homeopaths, for the cure of the disease, and that it was not less extensively employed by the regular profession. Why, then, were not the two equally successful? Why should the former cure all their patients with camphor, while in the hands of the latter, the same medicine was wholly impotent, as these gentlemen would have it understood?

The committee next express their opinion of the regular profession, of whom, they say, "for the last two thousand years, they have added to not less than they have taken from the mortality of disease by their prescriptions." For this we have no reply, other than to ask the reader if it can be believed? Or can the authors of such a statement expect to retain the confidence or respect of the regular profession, and those who employ them? And, above all, can they rationally expect a deferential reply to a declaration so unmitigated in its disrespect, and so utterly false in its statement of facts? In perfect harmony with this, however, the committee proceed to comment upon the conduct of the regulars in Cincinnati. They say :

"In the year 1840, *Homeopathy* commenced her mission in Cincinnati, as usual, amid the scoffs and sneers of the professors of *Allopathy*. Her course has been quiet and unobtrusive. While *Allopathy* has had its monthly 'Lancet,' and has almost daily commended its own performances in the political journals of the day, she has been *silent*. In the mean time, the *Doctors* of *Homeopathy* have been denied all place among the medical faculty; their individual statements have been pronounced false; and contempt has been cast on those who countenanced them. They have been greeted as "*Quacks*," "*Impostors*," "*Foreigners*," "*Germans*;" and where they have had occasion to enforce the collection of their fees in a court of law, *there* they have been met by their *Allopathic* opponents, *under oath*, seeking to drive them from the bar of justice; and they have been reduced to the mortifying necessity of exhibiting to a court and jury in Hamilton county, their medical diplomas, before they could be allowed to claim payment for their professional services."

This extract, in all its details, we are compelled to pronounce untrue. The committee are, doubtless, honest in their belief, as they were, no doubt, so informed, but we beg to assure them, and all concerned, that the above statements are utterly false.

First. The course of *Homeopathy* has not been "quiet and un-

obtrusive," as affirmed by the committee; in that the whole country has been flooded with pamphlets, containing popular appeals to the people, and extravagant reports of success, while the daily secular press has, also, been employed to trumpet the fame of Homeopathy — a thing unprecedented in the regular profession.

Second. It is not true, as stated, that Allopathy "has almost daily commended its own performances in the political journals of the day." Nay, verily we may say, it is utterly false. There is nothing more contemptible than this in the eyes of the regular profession. It is true that they have the monthly "Lancet;" but it is equally true that it is intended for the eye of the medical profession, and, that in it no man is permitted to advertise his success in practice: and the same is true of all our medical journals. The case, however, is widely different with the Homeopaths. They, too, have their journals, one of which is now on our table and, instead of being devoted to the investigation of medical subjects, it is almost exclusively filled with puffs of Homeopathic success, as are the political journals of the day. We allude to "The North Western Journal of Homeopathy," than which, a more contemptible thing has never appeared upon our table. The cover is green, the contents greener, and the editor himself is the greenest of all.

Third. It is not true that the regular profession have met them at the bar of justice, to prevent them from recovering their claims. In this, as in other instances, the committee have no doubt been deceived, perhaps by the very men whom they have volunteered to defend. It has been the settled policy of the regulars to testify in all cases where the legal claims of quacks were in question, that they should be paid the regular fees, because those who employ them do it of choice, with a full knowledge of their character and claims. Moreover, it is known that no statute exists in Ohio which requires the exhibition of diplomas in order to the collection of fees, as the committee would have us believe; and of this Mr. Taft, as a lawyer, ought to have been apprized.

There is nothing, we confess, in this report, upon which we look with so much contempt, as upon this effort of the committee to enlist the sympathies of the community, by the cry of persecution. No physician in this city, we are sure, has so often resorted to law for the recovery of claims as Doctor Palte, and no one, we presume, has been more successful than he in recovering them.

It is true that we call them quacks, because they are quacks,

unmitigated quacks—as base in their pretensions to knowledge of medical science, as in their designs upon the people.

It is also stated by this committee, that Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann's report was in answer to a public call through the papers. We are aware that one call for reports was made *anonymously* through one of the city journals, and beyond that, we believe no calls of the sort were ever made.

On the subject of doses, the committee say, that "*one grain of mercury would last a physician in full business for years, and that a single grain of arsenic would suffice for all the homeopathic physicians in the city an entire year,*" and so of other medicines.

Reader, what think you of this as a system of practice? Can any one believe that medicines thus employed can ever effect a cure in any given case? For ourself we could as easily believe that the heavens are brass, and that the earth is a whale in the midst of the ocean. But in turn, we are asked if cures are not effected by those who practice the system. To this we respond in the affirmative. But this is no proof that the system itself is true, because we have already clearly established the fact that allopathic treatment is resorted to in disguise, by those who profess to be practicing Homeopathy; moreover, we know it to be a fact, that in many instances the slightest indisposition is named, by pretenders, typhous fever, cholera, scarlatina, croup, or some other terrible malady, for the sake of acquiring a reputation for the cure of that which never existed. But where such diseases actually occur, if allopathic treatment is not adopted, the patient dies as certainly as that he is sick, except in those instances where nature alone is adequate to the cure.

But if one grain of medicine is sufficient for all the homeopathic physicians in this city, as affirmed by the committee, it would allow probably the millionth part of a grain to each box of cholera preventives, which are sold, we are informed, at from \$1.50 to \$5.00 per box. This is paying quite liberally for the millionth part of a grain of medicine, with as much sugar as a man may carry in his vest or pantaloons pocket. But to say nothing of the enormous price demanded, is not the man to be pitied who can be duped into a reliance upon a small box of sugar, which contains the millionth part of a grain of veratrum, copper, spurred rye, and camphor, for the prevention and cure of cholera? And is not the pretender who thus deceives his brother to the death, justly entitled to eternal execration.

There are at present in the city fifteen homeopathic physicians,

and if one grain of each kind of medicine is sufficient for them all for a whole year, as affirmed, there would be one fifteenth of a grain to each. This is indeed a tremendous outfit for a year's practice; and yet it would seem that thus booted and spurred, armed and equipped, these brave knights go forth to glorious war with the king of terrors, employ what disease he may. With the fifteenth part of a grain of each kind of medicine in his pocket, the homeopathic doctor is fully prepared to practice for a full year, according to the showing of the committee; and yet we are expected to treat the subject gravely, and be quite deferential to those who are the dupes of a theory thus ridiculously absurd.

Having now completed the review of the report, we beg leave to bestow a few thoughts upon the "ADDENDA" at the close, which contains, first of all, the reports of the homeopathic physicians in Cincinnati, viz., Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann, Bauer, Sturm, Peck, Parks, Burnham, Hutchinson, Rehwinkle, Davis, Dart, and Price, twelve in all, ten of whom report about eleven hundred cholera patients; but, like Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann, they furnish no clue to the names or residences of those who lived or died; which, of course, prevents all who might be disposed to inquire into the accuracy of their statements from doing so, either with respect to the one or the other—the deaths or the cures. True to the types, they alledge that none were lost who might have been expected to recover. In other words, their cholera patients were all saved to whom they were called in time: And with this the committee appear as content as though the expectations of the public had been fully met.

But this "addenda" reveals another startling fact, which fully demonstrates the want of accuracy in Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann's report. It seems that the cholera patients reported by all the other homeopathic physicians, ten in number, do not equal the number reported by Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann. And it is still more startling that Doctor Bauer, with the aid of his brother, only attended seventy-three cases, and fifty-four of these were Germans. We ask the attention of the committee themselves to this fact. Is it not known that he, and every other physician, even those least known, was busily employed during the prevalence of the cholera? How then account for the fact that Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann attended eleven hundred and sixteen cases, while Doctor Bauer and his brother attended but seventy-three? The answer must be, that Doctor Bauer was conscientious in making his report; *for which we trust he will not lose his reward.*

The second item in the "addenda," claiming our attention, is the letter of Mr. Barrett, a member of the committee, who says: "It is not my (his) design to appear as the advocate of Homeopathy." We suppose he is sincere in this; but really, it is difficult to believe, after reading his letter, from which we extract the following as a specimen, and from which it will be seen that he betrays all the feeling the warmest advocate of Homeopathy could be expected to exhibit. In replying to an extract which attributed the mortality among the Germans to the fact that they depended chiefly upon homeopathic practice, and the practice of foreigners (a fact which we believe), he says: "I could hardly refrain from a burst of indignant feeling on reading the extract above referred to; for I felt that it may (might) mislead the inhabitants of the eastern cities, and prevent many from knowing the blessings of Homeopathy," etc. Now this, we assure our readers, is in perfect keeping with his whole letter, from first to last; and yet, he declares, "it is not his wish to appear as the advocate of Homeopathy." Comment is unnecessary, as no man can respect declarations like this, with such outbursts of zeal before his eyes, in the advocacy of the very thing which he declares he has no wish "to advocate." Nor is this all. He gives the most exaggerated report of the success of Homeopathy which we have ever seen from the pen even of those who "did wish to advocate" its claims—the report of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann not excepted. Hear him! He says: "There are, in his pastoral charge, in all, one hundred and four families, eighty-six of whom relied upon Homeopathy; that one hundred and sixty of these had the cholera, and were all cured but one, who was past recovery when the doctor arrived." Could any thing be more extravagant than this? Or any thing harder to believe than that out of eighty-six families one hundred and sixty had the cholera, and that all but one were cured?

In the congregation to which we belong, numbering considerably more than that of which he has charge, there were but ten cases, so far as we have been able to ascertain, and, therefore, we are totally at a loss to assign a reason for the difference in the number of cases in the two congregations. And while we have no wish to charge Mr. Barrett with false representations, we are really unable to account for the peculiar predisposition of his people to cholera, or the predilections of the disease for his people—and yet, if his report be true, this angel of death was, in some way, peculiarly interested with Mr. Barrett's congregation. In

the city, and the bounds of the city practice, there are at a fair calculation one hundred and fifty thousand people; and if one third of all these had the cholera, as in the congregation of this gentleman, it would prove conclusively that fifty thousand had the disease, or that the epidemic did not prevail among others as it did among our Swedenborgian brethren, under the care of Mr. Barrett. Moreover, it will be seen from this calculation, that after all, the homeopathic doctors attended but a very small number of those who had the disease, extravagant as their report appeared, because the whole twelve only treated in all, according to the showing of the committee, twenty-four hundred and ten cases, leaving still nearly forty-eight thousand to the treatment of others; and yet these gentlemen have almost filled the world with their reports of success, while all the others, with a few exceptions, have been silent. How, then, can it be said by the committee that "Homeopathy has been quiet and unobtrusive?" And how can Mr. Barrett affirm that he "does not wish to appear as the advocate of Homeopathy?" We leave our readers to judge for themselves, and answer these questions as best they may, without involving the veracity of the one or the other.

Now, if the above calculation, which is based upon the statement of Mr. Barrett, be correct, it shows, conclusively, that the mortality attending the treatment of the remaining forty-eight thousand, was still less than that attending the practice of the Homeopaths, as exhibited in the report of the committee. But, unfortunately, neither the one nor the other can boast of results like this. The number of deaths from cholera amounted, in all, we believe, to about seven thousand. The regular profession, we have ascertained, with some degree of accuracy, lost, in all, about twelve hundred cases, which still leaves five thousand eight hundred deaths to be accounted for. Who, then, are responsible for these? The Indian and Negro Doctors have published their disclaimers; the Homeopaths have washed their hands in innocence. One hundred and fifty regulars lost but about twelve hundred cases, and, of course, the Steamers, and Eclectics, would naturally be expected to answer for the balance, were it not a well-attested fact, that those who died were chiefly Germans, who did not employ American physicians.

Who then, we repeat, are accountable for the thousands above alluded to? The fact that they were principally Germans, and that nearly all the German practitioners are Homeopaths, will furnish a clue to the answer.

In conclusion, we invite the attention of the reader to a summing up of the evidence, in support of the several charges urged against Doctors Pulte and Ehrmann, by the editor of the Expositor, viz :—

I. That they were guilty of exaggeration, in reporting eleven hundred and sixteen cases of cholera, and but two deaths, among their American patients, numbering in all four hundred and seventy-four. We have argued —

First. That it was not possible for them to have attended the number specified, even, without the addition of the thirteen hundred and fifty cases of mixed character, of which they speak, and the other cases referred to ; in their report all of which, according to a previous calculation, would have required of them nearly fifteen thousand visits in ninety days.

Second. We have shown that the sale of cholera preventives, by these gentlemen, in their office, with attention to obstetrical practice and other professional business, must have employed about one third of all their time ; which would have reduced it (for attending upon the cases above specified) to about two months, making the enormous sum total of something like fifteen thousand visits in sixty days.

Third. We have shown that ten other homeopathic physicians, as exhibited in the committee's report, do not equal, in all, the number reported by these two gentlemen, although each and all of them were, probably, as busily employed as they ; which proves conclusively that no reliance can be placed upon their representations.

Fifth. We have proved, by the report of the committee themselves, not by open concessions, but by admissions, that seven out of the nine Americans, named by the Expositor, died in their hands, which affords proof positive that the bulletin of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann was at fault on the score of truthfulness.

Sixth. We have shown that the method adopted by the committee for the investigation of the subject, was strictly *ex parte* ; and that their report, at least, in part, was founded upon the statements of Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann themselves, and that it is not, therefore, entitled to as high a consideration as the showing of the Expositor, which was predicated of statements made by disinterested persons, who were cognizant of the facts they related.

Seventh. We have shown in the preceding pages, that prior to the issuing of this report of the committee, nine new American cases, with names and residences, were announced through the


Commercial, as having died in their hands, against which the committee have not opposed even a naked denial. Add to these, three which have since been reported to us on reliable authority, and it will be seen that nineteen Americans, instead of two, were lost by Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann during the late epidemic, with from fifty to sixty Germans, instead of thirty-three, as reported in their bulletin. It is possible, we admit, that they may not have intended to deceive, but that the facts are in contradiction of their statements is absolutely certain; and that the committee were at fault in their manner of investigation, is not less true.

II. It was charged by the Expositor, that Homeopaths used allopathic remedies in the treatment of the cholera, giving camphor in full doses, and other medicines not in harmony with the doctrines of the founder of the system, such as cupram, secale, cornutum, etc., neither of which, in moderate, or even "large doses," are capable of producing symptoms analogous to the disease. In support of this charge it is argued—

First. That Hahnemann, in testing the homeopathic action of different medicines, resorted to the use of even smaller doses than those employed by the regular profession, such as one grain of quinine three times a day.


Second. That the committee adopt "*large doses*" of medicine to elucidate the same proposition, "*similia similibus curantur*," while in fact, they predicate their reasoning of "POISONOUS, OR IMMODERATE DOSES," as evinced by their appeal to the United States Dispensatory, in proof of their assumption, that camphor was a homeopathic remedy for the cholera, because, in "IMMODERATE DOSES," it produced some of the symptoms of that disease, which shows clearly, that they, in reaching their conclusion, not only abandoned the rule adopted by Hahnemann, but that they also abandoned the rule adopted by themselves; and even then, it is apparent that neither camphor nor the other medicines used by Homeopaths, are homeopathic remedies for cholera.

And finally, we have proved, by authority which cannot be disputed, that Hahnemann was not the first to recommend camphor for the cure of cholera, as affirmed by the committee, but that it had been used by the regular profession for the treatment of that disease in India, some eleven years prior to the time specified in their report, and hence, we have sustained every charge urged by the Expositor against Drs. Pulte and Ehrmann, with respect to every point, both great and small.





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 194 749 6